DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 275 CS 209 115

AUTHOR Giffard, C. Anthony
TITLE News Agency Coverage of the United States Withdrawal from UNESCO.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (68th, Memphis, TN, August 3-6, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Content Analysis; Developing Nations; Freedom of Speech; *Information Sources; International Relations; *Media Research; *News Media; Newspapers; *News Reporting; *Press Opinion; Public Opinion
IDENTIFIERS Information Flow; *News Agencies; *News Bias; News Sources; New World Information Order; Unesco

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine news coverage of the U.S. withdrawal from Unesco. News reports distributed by the Associated Press, United Press International, New York Times News Service, and Washington Post-Los Angeles Times News Service were studied to determine how adequate a foundation they were providing Americans for independent judgment on the merits of the withdrawal. Taken as a whole, the 173 news items were strongly anti-Unesco and supportive of a U.S. withdrawal. More than two-thirds of the themes identified in the reports were critical of Unesco. Only a quarter were favorable toward the agency and critical of the withdrawal. A small proportion focused on the future. Allegations that Unesco was politicized, mismanaged, anti-free press and badly in need of reform greatly outnumbered denials that this was the case, or affirmations as to the value of Unesco programs. The views of those in the United States and elsewhere who see some merit in Unesco's programs and who seek reform from within the organization did not appear to have been adequately represented. The results indicated that American readers with no other source of information than their newspapers would have received a very one-sided picture of the Unesco dispute, one that stressed the position of the U.S. government and largely ignored the views of organizations in the United States and developing nations that would be hurt by the U.S. withdrawal. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED258275

News Agency Coverage of the United States Withdrawal from UNESCO

by

C. Anthony Giffard

AEJMC
Memphis
August 1985

Research Assistants:

Michael J. Cochran
Carolyn M. Byerly

CS 209 115

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. A. Giffard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The United States withdrawal from UNESCO in 1984 prompted an unprecedented volume of coverage of the agency's activities by American news media. This coverage is of interest for several reasons. One is that it provides a case study of the validity of complaints by developing countries that issues of importance to them are treated unsympathetically by Western media. UNESCO, although largely supported by contributions from Western nations, spends the bulk of its funds on programs aimed at improving education science and culture in the developing world. Many of its programs also are of considerable value to organizations in the United States. One question is whether those activities were fairly represented in U.S. media coverage of the withdrawal.

Another is whether the coverage met the proclaimed Western journalistic ideals of objectivity, impartiality and balance. American news organizations played an active role in opposing moves in UNESCO to implement a New World Information Order, and appear to have contributed to the U.S. decision to withdraw. This raises questions as to whether the media were able to report impartially on events in which they were committed participants.

The aim of this study is to examine an important part of this coverage: news reports distributed by the two major news agencies, The Associated Press and United Press International, and two influential news services, the New York Times News Service and the Washington Post Los Angeles Times service to determine how adequate a foundation they were providing Americans for independent judgment on the merits of the withdrawal.

BACKGROUND

The U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO is the culmination of a long and increasingly bitter debate in that agency over communications issues. The mandate in UNESCO's charter to promote the "free flow of ideas by word or image" reflected the ideology and foreign policy objectives of the Western countries, particularly the United States, that dominated the agency in its early years. The "free flow" concept was enthusiastically supported by American media organizations which saw in it an opportunity to further weaken the pre-war stranglehold on information held by European news cartels.

There were few dissenting voices: the Soviet Union boycotted UNESCO until the mid-1950s, and most of the world's present nation states were still colonies, with no voice in international fora. The free flow doctrine came under challenge, however, as more nations, particularly in Africa and Asia, achieved independence and a vote in U.N. agencies. UNESCO meetings and conferences then became the primary forum for complaints by developing nations about Western domination of international communications channels, and for demands for a more balanced circulation of news. This debate resulted in the establishment, in January 1975, of the Non-Aligned News Agencies Pool, coordinated by the Yugoslav news agency TANJUG, and intended to provide

objective information on economic, social and cultural development in the Third World. The news pool was seen by some as the first direct challenge to the power of the Western news agencies.[1]

Inevitably, the views of what was by now a majority of its membership influenced UNESCO's position on communications issues. The agency's previous unconditional support for a "free flow of information" was modified to back instead a "free and balanced flow." It was at UNESCO's 18the General Conference in Nairobi in 1976 that the communications debate first attracted widespread attention in the world's press. At issue were two resolutions on information policy. One was a Tunisian resolution, calling for a more balanced and diversified exchange of news, and asking UNESCO to support the Non-Aligned News Agencies Pool. The other was the Soviet-sponsored mass media declaration that condemned Western news agencies for presenting a distorted view of the developing world, and mandated governmental responsibility "for the activities in the international sphere of all news media under their jurisdiction." The United States and other Western governments went along with the Tunisian resolution, partly to circumvent adoption of the draft mass media declaration with its unacceptable endorsement of state regulation of the media. The mass media declaration was referred instead to a commission that would study the problem and come up with recommendations.

In exchange for shelving the declaration, the United States promised to help Third World countries improve their communications capabilities by training journalists and providing satellite links.

The Nairobi conference also instructed UNESCO Director-general Amadou Mahtar M'Bow to undertake a review of communications issues in contemporary society in the light of developments in international relations and technological progress.[2] This led to in the appointment of the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, under the chairmanship of Sean MacBride. By this time, as MacBride noted later, the debate on communication issues "had stridently reached points of confrontation in many areas. Third World protests against dominant flow of news from the industrialized countries were often construed as attacks on the free flow of information. Defenders of journalistic freedom were labelled intruders on national sovereignty. Varying concepts of news values and the rights, roles and responsibilities of journalists were widely contended, as was the potential contribution of the mass media to the solution of major world problems."[3]

News organizations in the United States and Western Europe, perceiving a threat to their operations in the Third World, began to pay close attention to UNESCO's communication policies. This became evident in Western press coverage of the 1978 UNESCO General Conference in Paris. Once again the agenda included a revised draft of the Soviet-sponsored mass media declaration, with its call for governmental control of the media.

Faced by the implacable hostility of Western delegates, the Soviet draft declaration was amended to omit any references to the

duty of states in regulating media, and although it demanded a "free flow and a wider and better balanced dissemination of information," it proved largely acceptable to the West.[4] The declaration called for free and balanced flow, but did not define either, so the issue remained unresolved. The eleven articles were in fact worded vaguely enough for all parties to claim victory.

The compromise, however, did not impress some U.S. media. The New York Times editorialized that although Western diplomats were congratulating themselves on having turned "a dangerous international declaration on the obligations of the press into an incomprehensible hodgepodge of slogans and prescriptions," the declaration remained an affront to the very idea of communication. "The world deserves to know that the Americans who accepted it as the least offensive document they could write with 145 other nations were not speaking for the free press of the United States."[5]

The 21st UNESCO General Conference, held in Belgrade in 1980, was to be the forum for discussion of the report of the MacBride Commission, a significant attempt to achieve consensus among nations of very different ideological persuasions on ways to achieve a "new more just and more efficient world information and communication order."[6] The report contains a strong affirmation of libertarian press values, but also a clear bias against private-sector involvement in communications media. The report itself was not voted on at the conference. Instead delegates adopted recommendations by M'Bow that states take action on a national level to implement its proposals.

Despite Western delegates' success in watering down the more extreme demands for a new information order, press coverage of the conference in the United States was strongly hostile, to the point of urging that the U.S. withdraw from UNESCO if it persisted in its attacks on press freedom.

UNESCO's 22nd General Conference in Paris in 1982 again drew critical attention from Western media. Most of the coverage centered on just one of 13 programs ratified as part of the agency's five-year plan. The focus was on the program "Communication in the Service of Man," which called for countries to develop national communication policies, for training in all aspects of communication, for "free flow and wider and better balanced dissemination of information," and for increased exchanges of news and programs.[7] Third World delegates urged that steps be taken to curb the dominance of the major news agencies; the United States and other Western delegations feared the plan would lead to curbs on press freedom by giving governments the right to license journalists and establish international codes of journalistic ethics. Two weeks of diplomatic bargaining led to a compromise that established a framework for a new information order, but toned down criticism of Western news agencies, and included a passage supporting the watchdog role of the press in exposing abuses of official power.

Western media, and particularly U.S. media organizations, were not detached observers of the debate in UNESCO. Alarmed by threats to their interests, they took steps to head off any new information order that would be inimical to their operations. To achieve this the U.S.

media adopted several key strategies. One was to form a new organization, the World Press Freedom Committee, that would coordinate and spearhead their campaign. This committee became actively involved in UNESCO conferences and meetings, lobbying on behalf of the free flow of information. It organized conferences to articulate traditional Western press values -- such as the Declaration of Talloires, adopted in May, 1981. And it put pressure on Congress and the State Department to take a stronger line against UNESCO's media policies.

Other media organizations that played an active role in opposing UNESCO communications policies include the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the International Press Institute, and the Inter American Press Association.

For the Western media to being about change in UNESCO policies, however, that had to exert more direct pressure. And to achieve this they had to enlist the aid of Western governments, who provide the bulk of UNESCO's budget. The U.S. alone contributed 25 percent of the agency's income, and threats of withholding that could be a powerful lever in effecting desired reforms.

In this U.S. this meant working through Congress, which appropriates funds for international organizations. Getting support from Congress was not difficult: few officials are unaware of the power of the media in election campaigns, and most needed little convincing, having been reared on the free press ideology.

The media exerted influence on Congress in several ways. News reports and editorials critical of UNESCO set the agenda for congressional debate. Many of these items were read into the Congressional Record. Media representatives testified at Congressional hearings, and argued for a stronger line against UNESCO.

One result was an amendment to the State Department Appropriations Bill in August 1982 that threatened to cut off the U.S. funding for UNESCO if that agency should implement any plan to license journalists, impose a mandatory code of ethics, or in any way restrict the free flow of information. And in December 1983 the U.S. informed UNESCO that it intended to withdraw from the organization a year later. The present study covers the period from that announcement until the U.S. formally withdrew in December, 1984.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

There have been several previous studies of media coverage of UNESCO activities. These include a report on news coverage of the 1980 UNESCO General Conference in Belgrade, prepared by the U.S. National News Council, and a report on the coverage of the Paris conference in 1982, prepared by George Gerbner, Dean of the Annenberg School of Communication at the University of Pennsylvania.

The National News Council study examined 448 news clippings and 206 editorials from newspapers throughout the United States relating

to the Belgrade meeting. The six-week conference in the fall of 1980 dealt with scores of UNESCO activities, including its work in combating illiteracy, developing alternate energy sources, protecting historic monuments, and broadening educational and research programs for scientists and engineers. But, says the study, not one story emanating from the conference dealt with these topics. Instead, the focus was on political confrontation at the meeting, and particularly the debate over UNESCO's communications policies. News analysis and factual stories, said the report, "concentrated almost exclusively on Western worries about the UNESCO initiative, with little presentation of opposing viewpoints."[8] The study concludes that "the imbalance that characterized most of the Belgrade coverage in this country provided an inadequate foundation for independent judgement by Americans of the correctness of the editorial positions their newspapers were taking on the UNESCO communications issue. Equally troublesome, the imbalance set a poor example of Third World journalists and other skeptics on what they should find admirable as a model of press freedom and immunity from governmental control in Western journalistic practice."[9]

The next UNESCO general conference took place in Paris in the fall of 1982. Coverage of that event was studied by George Gerbner, under contract to UNESCO. Gerbner analyzed reports that appeared in U.S. newspapers, in wire stories from the AP and UPI, UNESCO press releases, and responses to a letter of inquiry sent to journalists who covered the conference.

Although the conference covered a wide range of topics, the news coverage focused almost exclusively on communications issues: UNESCO's promotion of a New World Information Order and related themes. Gerbner concluded that the American press had viewed the session mostly from its own institutional vantage point: "The press constructed a picture of the meetings more from selected speeches and prior information than from the actual resolutions and official actions of the conference. That construction showed a preoccupation with real and imagined threats to private control of the press to the virtual exclusion of other issues."[10]

As far as editorials were concerned, Gerbner noted that "a defensive, belligerent and often paranoid tone pervaded most editorials published about the conference. There was little recognition of America points of view other than that of the press and its trade associations and public relations spokespersons."[11]

METHOD

The present study is a content analysis of reports transmitted by the Associated Press, United Press International, the New York Times News Service, and the Washington Post/Los Angeles Times News Service between December 1983 and December 1984. The unit of analysis was the theme. Altogether 189 different themes were identified. The 173 news agency reports coded yielded 1,945 such thematic statements. The 189 themes were aggregated into successively larger categories for analysis.

FINDINGS

General Orientation

Taken as a whole, the coverage was strongly anti-UNESCO and supportive of the U.S. withdrawal. More than two-thirds of the themes were critical of UNESCO; only a quarter were favorable toward the agency and critical of the withdrawal. A small proportion focused on the future. The first column in Table 1 shows the total coverage for all agencies over the entire year.

Anti-UNESCO/pro-withdrawal

Of the coverage critical of UNESCO, the most common complaint was that the agency was politicized (Table 2). This issue included general assertions of politicization; statements that UNESCO was anti-Western, anti-American and anti-Israel, and that it was supportive of the enemies of Western values.

The second-largest cluster of criticisms centered on allegations of mismanagement, both budgetary and organizational. The issue "mismanagement" included themes relating to increases, mismanagement and inefficiency in UNESCO's budget, references to the U.S. General Accounting Office audit in 1984 that criticized UNESCO in this regard, and to allegations that too much was spent on bureaucracy. Also included in this issue were criticisms of UNESCO's organization: that it was too bureaucratic, that its staff was concentrated in Paris, and that it favored Third World personnel.

The third-ranked issue critical of UNESCO concerned demands that it should mend its ways. Most of the themes relating to the need for reform were stated in very general terms -- the U.S. would withdraw unless there was "significant" change, or "radical" change.

Other themes were specific as to what UNESCO should or should not do. It would, for example, have to improve its management and efficiency, select staff on the basis of merit, hold fewer meetings and publish fewer documents, and take "practical" steps to implement its charter. On the other hand, it would have to stop politicizing issues, stop supporting government control of news media, become less ideological, stop its "diatribes," stop attacking Western values, and curb its bureaucratic growth. As regards the NWIO, UNESCO would have to stop attacking Western press values and the free flow of information, and quit backing state control of media.

Fourth came press issues. Here UNESCO was accused of supporting a New World Information Order, of favoring state control of media systems, of wanting to license journalists and impose codes of conduct on the press, and of seeking economic regulation of the media. On the other hand, it was said to be opposed to press freedom, and to a free flow of news and information. These three issues -- politicization, mismanagement and press matters -- together accounted for almost one half of all the themes critical of UNESCO.

Related to the demands for change were themes asserting that although some reforms were promised or occurring, they were too little, and too late, to make the U.S. change its mind. UNESCO Director-General M'Bow was the target of some personal criticism, but this was far less frequent than attacks on UNESCO as an institution.

More than half of the reports mentioned that the U.S. paid 25 percent of UNESCO's budget, and several suggested that the Western nations, who provided the bulk of UNESCO's budget, were not getting value for their money, and that he who pays the piper should call the tune.

America's departure was seen as an impetus for reform, and as a warning to other international organizations. It was argued that the pullout would force UNESCO to prioritize its programs and eliminate undesirable ones. These critical themes were given credence by references to support for the U.S. position from other governments.

Pro-UNESCO/anti-withdrawal

Themes supportive of UNESCO appeared far less frequently. They fell into two main categories: those that defended UNESCO, and those that criticized the U.S. for withdrawing. The defenses, in turn, comprised two clusters of themes: denials of the criticisms of UNESCO, and affirmations as to the value of its programs. These denials, however, were outnumbered by criticisms on these issues in the ratio of 20 to 1.

The affirmations included themes to the effect that UNESCO was trying to implement reforms, that it was improving its management and budgetary procedures. Useful programs were mentioned, including UNESCO's role in promoting education, science and culture, and its work in facilitating Third World development. Support for the agency -- mostly from the Soviet Union and France -- was mentioned only half as often as support for the U.S. position from other governments.

A substantial number of themes related to criticism of the U.S. action, whether direct or implied. The largest category concerned the disadvantages to the U.S. of the pullout. Here the most frequent theme was that the U.S. would better serve its interests by remaining a member of UNESCO and working for reform from within. The pullout was seen as politically naive in that it deprived the U.S. of a voice in the agency. There were a few references to American groups, particularly scientists, who stood to lose international contacts and access to information.

Also included in criticisms of the withdrawal were themes relating to the impact of the pullout on UNESCO. The most common were that it would undermine the agency's utility and universality. There was virtually no mention of the effect the loss of U.S. funding would have on useful programs in the Third World.

Looking Ahead

A relatively small number of themes focussed not on the pro- or anti-UNESCO arguments, but on the issue of what would happen next. These included the future of the U.S. relationship with UNESCO, the future of UNESCO itself, and possible alternatives to UNESCO programs.

Inter-agency Variations

When comparing the coverage by the different agencies, the most remarkable feature is their similarity. The AP, New York Times and Washington Post all carried almost three times as many themes critical of UNESCO as those supporting it. UPI was marginally less critical, but two-thirds of its themes were anti-unesco and in favor of the withdrawal.

The AP coverage came closest to the mean for all agencies. Politicization, mismanagement, the need for reform and press issues were the themes that appeared most frequently (Table 2). These four themes alone accounted for 55 percent of its coverage. Only a quarter of the themes reported by the AP were supportive of UNESCO or critical of the withdrawal.

The New York Times and Washington Post coverage was very similar to that of the AP. The New York Times was most critical of UNESCO's politicization and also placed a strong empnasis on the need for reform. Sixty percent of the New York Times coverage related to politicization, the need for reform, mismanagement and press issues. As in the case of the AP, only 25 percent of the New York Times themes supported UNESCO.

The themes mentioned most frequently by the Washington Post were politicization and the need for reform. The Post was less concerned with UNESCO's communications policies than the other agencies. It was, however, proportionately twice as critical of M'Bow's leadership than the others, accusing him of being anti-western and calling for his resignation. The top four issues accounted for 53 percent of the Post's news coverage.

UPI differed from the others in that it was significantly less critical and more supportive of UNESCO. It was the least critical of UNESCO's politicization and management and, conversely, the most critical of the withdrawal. Nevertheless, almost two-thirds of the themes it reported were anti-UNESCO.

REPORTERS

The study analyzed also the output of specific reporters. Nearly half of the reports in the sample from the AP did not carry a by-line; for UPI the figure was over one-half. The New York Times attributed all but 16 percent of its sampled reports to specific correspondents. All of the Washington Post reports carried a by-line.

Three-quarters of the reports on the four wires came from just 13 sources: those carried by the AP, UPI and the New York Times without a by-line, plus those attributed to 10 named correspondents. For the AP, 75 percent came from the agency as such, or from only two reporters: Harry Dunphy filing from Paris, and Morris W. Rosenberg from Washington, D.C. Two-thirds of the anonymous AP reports carried a Paris dateline.

More than three-quarters of the UPI reports either carried no by-line or the by-line of just two reporters: Aline Mosby in Paris, and J.J. Nguyen at the United Nations. The New York Times relied on Paul Lewis in Paris for nearly a third of its reports. Also filing from Paris were E.J. Dionne Jr.,and occasionally Richard Bernstein. Most of their reports with a Washington dateline were filed by B. Drummond Ayres and Bernard Gwertzman. These reports together comprise 70 percent of the New York Times themes in the sample.

For the Washington Post, Walter Pincus and Joanne Omang filing from Washington, and Michael Dobbs from Paris, account for two-thirds of the service's coverage.

The major reporters, without exception, were more critical than supportive of UNESCO (Table 3). Only Nguyen of UPI came close to balanced coverage, although the reports carried by UPI without a by-line also were comparatively even-handed. Yet at least 65 percent of the themes reported by the major correspondents for all four agencies were hostile towards UNESCO.

Among the top ten by-lined reporters, there was a remarkable degree of unanimity. If one ranks the issues each reported, all ten had both politicization and mismanagement in their top five categories. They also emphasized press issues and the need for reform. Several reported a substantial number of criticisms of the withdrawal, and statements supporting UNESCO programs. These were, however, outweighed by their overall criticism of UNESCO's performance.

The reports that did not carry individual by-lines differed from those that did in some significant respects. The AP, the UPI and the New York Times reports with only an agency credit were more likely to criticize UNESCO's politicization and New Information Order activities than those from named correspondents.

SOURCES

Given the apparent imbalance in coverage of the pro- and anti-UNSECO arguments, it is instructive to examine the sources quoted in the news agency reports. One quarter of the themes were not attributed to any specific source; they were simply statements of fact by the news agencies.

Of the themes that were attributed to specific sources, more than half were from various spokesmen for the U.S. government (first column, Table 4). The sources quoted most frequently were officials of the U.S. State Department. Together they comprised one-fifth of all

sources. Another fifth consisted of attributions to spokesmen for the U.S. government, the Reagan administration, U.S. officials, or simply Washington."

The second largest group of sources comprised representatives of various Western governments, who together accounted for another fifth of the total. Spokesmen for the British government, which had also announced its intention to withdraw from UNESCO, were quoted most often, followed by France (which opposed the pullout), West Germany and The Netherlands.

UNESCO sources, including M'Bow, accounted for just over one tenth of the total. The Soviet government, and spokesmen for various Third World governments, each contributed less than five percent of the attributions. Non-government organizations in the U.S. with an interest in UNESCO programs were even less visible.

Taken together, Western sources comprised 81 percent of the total attributions. UNESCO sources accounted for just 13 percent, the Soviet Union for 4 percent, and Third World for 2 percent.

Agency Sources

All four agencies relied primarily on official U.S. sources for their information (Table 4). The Washington Post, with three-fifths of its attributed statements coming from U.S. government spokesmen, appeared to be most closely associated with the official position. Only UPI attributed less than than half of its thematic statements to U.S. government sources. If one includes spokesmen for other Western governments, the AP, the NYT and the Washington Post all relied on Western government sources for more than three-quarters of their attributions. Add the Soviet Union and a handful of Third World governments, and the reliance on government sources rises to above 80 percent for all three. The combined figure for the Washington Post was 91 percent. UPI drew two-thirds of its attributed statements from Western government spokesmen, and three-quarters from government officials as a whole.

Since the sources quoted by the reporters clearly had their own agendas, it is instructive to analyze their orientation to UNESCO. U.S. government sources, who provided by far the bulk of the attributed statements, were also the most critical of UNESCO (Table 5). Western government spokesmen were not far behind, with three-quarters of the themes attributed to them being anti-UNESCO or favoring the U.S. withdrawal. As might be expected, UNESCO sources were largely favorable towards the agency, although the views of some dissidents were reported. But UNESCO sources were not quoted nearly as often as U.S. and Western government figures, and so had little impact on the overall orientation of the coverage. Themes attributed to Third World figures, and spokesmen for U.S. academic organizations, were chiefly supportive of UNESCO, but were too infrequent in the sample to be statistically significant.

UNESCO sources were highly critical of the pullout, spoke strongly in favor of UNESCO programs, and denied that politicization, mismanagement or press issues were a problem. They also asserted that

the West, and particularly the U.S., was waging a propaganda campaign against UNESCO and its director-general.

CONCLUSIONS

American readers with no other source of information than their newspapers would have received a very one-sided picture of the UNESCO dispute, one that stressed the position of the United States government and largely ignored the views of organizations in the U.S. and in the developing world that would be hurt by the withdrawal.

Altogether two-thirds of the themes in the news service reports were critical of UNESCO and supportive of the withdrawal. Only one-quarter supported UNESCO and opposed the pullout. Allegations that UNESCO was politicized, mismanaged, anti-free press and badly in need of reform, greatly outnumbered denials that this was the case, or affirmations as to the value of UNESCO programs.

This is not to suggest that the reports were untrue. It is quite likely that many of UNESCO's activities are, at least from a Western perspective, politicized, and that the agency could be better managed. But there is a substantial body of opinion, in the United States and elsewhere, that sees some merit in UNESCO's programs, and would prefer to seek reform from within. These views do not appear to have been adequately represented.

It is ironic also that American news agencies, which have argued against a New Information Order on the grounds that it would promote a press that would do little more than repeat government announcements, should have relied on government sources for the bulk of its coverage.

These findings suggest serious questions as to the balance and fairness of the information Americans were given as a basis for making an independent judgment on the merits of the withdrawal.

NOTES

[1] Leonard H. Marks, "New World Information Order: A Bad Idea that Refuses to Die," in The Media Crisis (Miami: World Press Freedom Committee, 1981) p. 29.

[2] Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, Foreword to the report of the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, Many Voices, One World (Paris: UNESCO, 1980) p. xiv.

[3] Sean MacBride, Preface to Many Voices, One World, p. xvii.

[4] Herbert Altschull, Agents of Power: The Role of News Media in Human Affairs (New York: Longmans, 1984) p. 217.

[5] New York Times, 27 Nov. 1978.

[6] ICSCP, Many Voices, One World, op. cit.

[7] UNESCO's Second Medium-Term Plan, reprinted in George Gerbner, "The American Press Coverage of the Fourth Extraordinary Session of the UNESCO General Conference, Paris 1982" (University of Pennsylvania: August 1983).

[8] National News Council, "Report on News Coverage of Belgrade UNESCO Conference" (New York: March 1981) p. 3.

[9] Ibid., p. 10.

[10] George Gerbner, op. cit., p. 38

[11] Ibid., p. 39.

TABLE 1

Orientation towards UNESCO of coverage by four news agencies

	Combined agencies	AP	UPI	NYT	W.Post
Number of themes	1,945	576	573	521	275
Anti-Unesco/ pro-withdrawal	70%	72%	65%	72%	72%
Pro-Unesco/ anti-withdrawal	27	25	31	25	25
Looking ahead	3	3	4	3	3
Totals	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 2

Issues covered by four news agencies

Number of themes	Combined agencies 1,945	AP 576	UPI 573	NYT 521	W.Post 275
Anti-Unesco/ pro-withdrawal					
Politicization	21%	21%	18%	23%	20%
Mismanagement	12	14	10	12	15
Reforms needed	11	10	10	12	13
Press issues	10	10	10	12	5
U.S. funds	5	5	6	5	4
Support for U.S.	4	5	5	3	4
Too little change	3	4	3	2	4
Criticism of M'Bow	2	1	1	2	5
Benefits to U.S.	2	2	2	1	2
Credibility at stake	<1	<1	<1	<1	0
Pro-Unesco/ anti-withdrawal					
Criticism of pullout	13	12	17	11	10
Affirmations	10	9	10	11	11
Denials of charges	2	2	3	1	4
Propaganda campaign	1	2	1	2	<1
Looking ahead					
Future	3	3	4	2	2
Alternatives	1	<1	1	1	1
Totals	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 3

Orientation towards Unesco of major reporters

	Number of themes	Anti-Unesco/ pro-pullout %	Pro-Unesco/ anti-pullout %	Looking ahead %
Associated Press				
AP (no by-line)	281	73	24	3
Dunphy (Paris)	94	72	27	1
Rosenberg (Wash)	58	67	28	5
United Press International				
UPI (no by-line)	342	60	37	3
Mosby (Paris)	114	73	23	4
Nguyen (UN)	25	52	48	0
New York Times				
NYT (no-byline)	85	84	15	1
Lewis (Paris)	157	83	16	1
Ayres (Wash)	41	61	32	7
Dionne (Paris)	37	68	32	0
Gwertzman (Wash)	47	85	11	4
Washington Post				
Pincus (Wash)	68	85	10	5
Omang (Wash)	66	64	33	3
Dobbs (Paris)	47	77	19	4

TABLE 4

Sources quoted by news agency reports
(excluding themes not attributed to a source)

	Combined agencies	AP	UPI	NYT	WP/LAT
Number of themes	1,524	472	446	375	231
U.S. Government	56%	56%	45%	54%	78%
Western governments	21	21	24	22	13
Unesco	13	12	19	9	7
U.S. NGOs	3	2	2	4	0
Soviet Government	4	4	4	5	0
Third World	2	3	5	1	0
U.S. academics	1	<1	0	5	0
U.S. media reps.	<1	<1	<1	0	0
Western media reps.	<1	<1	<1	0	0
Western NGOs	<1	<1	0	0	2
Totals	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 5

Orientation to Unesco of sources quoted in reports

	Number of Themes	Anti-Unesco/ pro-withdrawal %	Pro-Unesco/ anti-withdrawal %	Looking Ahead %
U.S. Government	848	82	14	4
Western governments	318	75	24	1
Unesco	191	16	74	10
Soviet Government	58	31	67	2
Third World	37	22	70	3
U.S. NGOs	36	53	36	11
U.S. academics	20	20	75	5
U.S. media reps.	5	80	20	0
Western media reps.	3	100	0	0
Western NGOs	5	100	0	0